DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 383 103 EA 026 760

AUTHOR Goldman, Paul; Conley, David T.
TITLE Systemic School Reform in Oregon: Can It Be Legislated?
PUB DATE 95
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 1995).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Policy Formation; Politics of Education; Resistance to Change; School Based Management; School Restructuring; *State Legislation; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Oregon; *Systemic Educational Reform

ABSTRACT

In 1991 the Oregon Legislature passed major school-reform legislation, the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century. The act contains the following provisions: early childhood education; nongraded, developmental education; outcomes-based education; comprehensive support services; and school-based decision making. Oregon's educators were not prepared for, nor did they participate, in the legislation's development. This paper presents findings of a study that examined Oregon educators' reactions to reform over the period 1992-94. Data were collected from a survey of all certified staff from 92 schools in 1992, 25 schools in 1993, and 72 schools in 1994. The return rates were 66, 65, and 66 percent, respectively. Interviews were conducted with 23 teachers, and focus-group sessions were conducted in 23 schools. Findings indicate that there is qualified support for restructuring in theory but dissatisfaction with the implementation process; individual and school demography did not predict attitudes, though urban districts and administrators tended to be more receptive; and substantial differences existed between districts and between schools. The data suggest that top-down policy will serve to energize local educators only if it is consistent and legislators and state DOE personnel recognize that their goals are: (1) to create a broad framework that supports local educators committed to improvement; (2) to provide enough resources and time for schools to adapt; (3) to successfully develop rules and regulations in response to and in support of new models; and (4) to identify effective accountability mechanisms. The ways in which educators interpret the actions of the legislature and department of education over the next year should indicate whether change becomes self-sustaining or is extinguished. Contains 16 references and 3 tables. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 383 103

Systemic School Reform in Oregon: Can It Be Legislated?

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paul Goldman
David T. Conley
College of Education
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403-1215
(503) 346-5065

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
P. Goldman
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Introduction: The Issues

Oregon's attempt to legislate large-scale reform, particularly in high schools, provides a test for the limits of a legislature's ability to effect changes in the basic direction, goals, and structure of a state's school system. This case further tests the power of educational policy when faced with a series of confounding effects, including a property tax limitation, school consolidation, and a change in political leadership midway through the implementation timeline of the reform program. In addition, the Oregon experience highlights the role and limitations of a state department of education as it attempts to move suddenly from a maintenance and regulatory role to one of leadership for systemic reform and redesign of schooling.

Oregon's experiences capture in microcosm the turbulence, unpredictability, and mutidimensionality of school reform. They show how state and local control both complement and clash, what the limits of centralized power are when delivery of educational services is fundamentally localized and beyond effective direction or control. They suggest how a vision of education can mobilize educators to action even if there is no overall coherent framework to support reform. And they suggest the limits to all of these phenomena.

This study tracks educator reaction to reform over a period of three years. It does so by presenting data from a survey instrument that was administered to a stratified random sample of educators each year, and by analyzing comments made by educators who completed the sample. These data provide the context for an analysis and discussion of the issues presented above. In this paper we attempt both to present data and to conjecture upon the likely cause and effect relationships that underlie the data.

EA026 760

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Major Provisions of The Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century

In 1991 the Oregon Legislature passed House Bill 3565, laying out a new vision of schooling for the state's 1,200 public elementary and secondary schools. Oregon's educators were neither prepared for, nor participated in, the development of this legislation. Instead, their attention had been focused on the state's recently enacted tax limitation measure, and its implications for education funding. Oregon's reform legislation is far reaching, encompassing policies from early childhood to post secondary education, from accountability to school governance. The Act presents a complex framework for systemic redesign of education, preschool through post-secondary. Influenced by Goals 2000, the Carnegie Report, and the National Center for Education and the Economy's report "America's Choice: High Skills or Low Wages" (1990), its intention was to create a "restructured educational system...to achieve the state's goals of the best educated citizens in the nation by the year 2000 and a work force equal to any in the world by the year 2010." Specifically, the Act contains the following provisions

- Readiness to learn: children should enter kindergarten ready to learn, the state will implement early childhood education programs that include pre-natal care, child-parent centers, and pre-kindergarten programs.
- Non-graded, developmental education: this includes multi-age classroom groupings pitched to the individual child's developmental level rather than his/her chronological age.
- Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM): satisfaction of performance objectives based on the expectation that 16-year olds will have the "knowledge and skills to read, write, problem-solve, think critically and communicate."
- Certificate of Advanced Mastery (CAM): satisfaction of performance objectives appropriate for entry into post-secondary education, training programs, and/or a professional-technical occupation.
- Comprehensive Support Services: The linking of social service agencies with schools and districts and the development of alternative learning centers for at-risk students and for those not making effective progress towards the CIM.
- Site-Based Decision-Making: School councils with parent and classified representatives but a teacher majority, responsible for

> determining school goals, ongoing progress, and determination of professional development.

Oregon's reforms differ from those proposed and enacted by states elsewhere. They are designed as shock treatment rather than as incremental changes that could be implemented gradually and sequentially year-by-year from early childhood to secondary education. This emphasis was made clear as the State Department of Education, and the larger educational community, began almost immediately to discuss and to try to operationalize the most radical of the legislated reforms: the competency-based CIM and CAM. This emphasis was not lost on the field. The following comment reflects the opinion of a sizable and vocal minority of educators:

> The big problem with 21st century Oregon Ed. Act is that they started with the high school and are working down to elementary. You should start with elementary and work up. The next big problem I see is that when students don't reach the bench marks for going on, are they going to be held back or are parents going to let them pass on when they are not ready? Schools need to be funded properly if this is going to work. Will the state legislature ever fund schools properly and fairly?

The statement highlights the dilemma that faced Oregon in the 1990s as schools struggled to adjust to decreased revenue accompanied by a shift from local to state funding of schools. Local property taxes had provided approximately two-thirds of school funding before 1990, one of the highest rates in the nation. Since Oregon has no sales tax, local property taxes to support schools were relatively high by the standard of western states.

In 1990 the state's voters approved Measure 5, which reduced school property tax rates successively over a five year period. The measure did not guarantee schools the same level of funding. Over the first four years of Measure 5 implementation, the state came to provide a majority of school funding. With control of funding comes increased legitimacy to dictate programs to local districts. When legislators passes school reform legislation in 1991 they had yet to appreciate their increased power over schools.

The Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century (House Bill 3565) was seen more as visionary guidance for the schools than as a blueprint for specific changes when it was passed. The bill reflected the legislature's more historical role of

providing general guidance for local districts. Having provided that guidance, the legislature proceeded to cut funding the following session while leaving reform requirements intact. Schools received the mixed message (from their persepctive); change your practices while we are cutting your resources. It is within this context that implementation of systemic reform has proceeded.

Research Methods

Research data come primarily from a series of self-administered questionnaires distributed and returned during Fall 1992, 1993, and 1994. The original eight-page questionnaire distributed in the first two years consisted of 99 forced-choice items, eight demographic items, and invited written comments in each section and on the final page. The forced choice items were grouped into the following areas: (1) knowledge of the legislation's major provisions; (2) beliefs about the law's *intent*; (3) assessment of the law's potential *effects*; (4) predictions about the success of implementation; (5) personal reactions, including how much each respondent might have to *change*, (6) what resources would be required for the law to be implemented; and (7) whether specific provisions will improve student learning. The 1994 survey was cut down to four pages and 49 items, each of which had been used in the two previous administrations.

The sample we developed in 1992 was stratified so that sampling units would be school districts and school buildings. This strategy provided a correction factor to overcome the extreme skewness in the size distribution of Oregon's 297 school districts, many of which are extremely small. Based on the number of students served, the state was divided into four groups each having roughly the same number of students, plus Portland, the one large urban district. Within each of the four categories, districts were randomly selected so that each category would proportionally represent its share of the state's student population. Hence, two districts each were selected from those having 10,500 to 30,000 and the 5,000 to 10,499 students respectively, four from districts with 2,000 to 4,999 students, and nine from those below 2,000. Within each school district, individual school buildings were randomly selected as follows: one high school, two middle schools or junior highs, and three elementary schools. In districts with fewer schools, all buildings were included in the study. We also selected two mid-sized districts as "case study districts," in which we surveyed every school in the district. Both of those districts

were in the 5,000 - 10,499 category. A total of 92 schools were included in the sample, 64 from the state sample and an additional 28 from those two districts. These procedures are described in more detail elsewhere (Conley & Goldman, 1995).

The 1993 sample of 24 schools was drawn from among schools we had surveyed the previous year. Analysis of the 1992 data resulted in the development of four scales. Scale 1, Supportive of Change, consists of items that indicate support for the Act and a general sense that schools should be changing Scale 2, Resistant to Change, reflects both skepticism about and disengagement from the Act. Scale 3 measures anticipated Changes in Practices, specifically in such areas as developmentally appropriate practices, integrating curriculum, and increased teacher collegiality and cooperation. Scale 4, Learning Outcomes, is taken directly from questions asking the respondents whether, in their opinion, specific features of the Act will lead to increased student learning. After aggregating responses by school rather than individual means, it was clear that school scores formed a continuum ranging from enthusiasm about to resistance to the restructuring legislation. We generated a summary rank order, and randomly selected 24 schools, seven each from the highest and lowest quartiles and ten from the middle half for the 1993 sub-sample. (Actually there were 25 schools because one middle school had divided its staff after opening a new building.)

For the 1994 sample, we wanted both to collect change data by following-up in schools we had already surveyed once or twice before, and also to add new schools as a control and to make certain that the original random selection process had not created an atypical sample. All schools in the 1993 sub-sample were re-surveyed to provide a three year panel. In addition, we randomly selected 24 schools from the remaining 68 schools in the original sample which gave us comparisons based on 1992 and 1994 data. Finally, we generated an entirely new 24 school sample based on the procedures used originally in 1992. This added one district in the 10,500+ student category, two in the 5,000 - 10,499 and 2,000 - 4,999 categories respectively, and two in the under 2,000 category.

In each school, questionnaires were distributed to all certified staff. In 1992 and 1993, researchers or research assistants visited the school, meeting with the principal and, if possible, addressing a faculty meeting. Questionnaires were distributed at a faculty meeting, and staff returned the anonymous completed

questionnaires to a drop box in the school office, and members of the research team either picked them up or they were bundled and mailed directly to the researchers' university office. In 1994, we made phone contact with principals and mailed questionnaires directly to them for distribution. In 1992, no district refused to participate, but one school did decline to participate and was replaced by another from the same district. Return rate was 66 percent resulting in 2,260 completed questionnaires. The 1993 return rate was 65 percent. In 1994, we did not receive data from four schools (one school's batch of questionnaires appears to have been lost in the mail). Of the 67 schools sending back questionnaires, the return rate was 66 percent.

It is worth noting that response rates exceed by a substantial margin those from a similar type of survey conducted in British Columbia during the first year of that province's mandated school reform. Researchers surveying teachers there reported a school participation rate of 67 percent and an individual response rate of 30 percent (Silns, 1992). We believe the high response rates resulted from a number of factors. Most important was educators' high interest in and strong feelings about the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century. Our appeal to administrators and teachers stressed our independence from both the legislature and the State Department of Education. The survey also provided a forum for teachers to express their attitudes not only to a general audience, but also to their building and district administrators, since we quickly returned summaries of school responses to each school. Several respondents welcomed the chance to provide input, a typical comment being: "thanks for letting the folks that are in the 'trenches' have a say, finally." We promised each school that we would both provide a school summary of responses in statistical form and that we would send each school a copy of our report. Our ability to send back this information in a timely fashion undoubtedly made access in subsequent years much easier.

In addition to the statistical data that came from questionnaire items, we examined written comments educators appended to the end of each section or to the comments page we included. Approximately 60 percent of respondents commented. In the 1992 survey, we encouraged respondents to elaborate on their beliefs about the Act, providing a phone number so they could initiate contact if they chose. Twenty-three teachers did respond. These interviews were taped and transcribed. Following the 1993 survey, we conducted focus groups in 23 of the 25 schools where

we had distributed surveys. The comments, interview, and focus group data, coming from the same respondents who completed questionnaires, are not as systematic and do not independently substantiate the statistical portrait of Oregon educators' attitudes toward the restructuring legislation. However, they serve several purposes: (1) they provide natural examples that illustrate and elaborate quantitative findings based on the types of narrowly constructed questions required of self-administered questionnaires; (2) they highlight particularly salient and/or strongly held attitudes that respondents wish to punctuate by their comments; and (3) they contribute insights about the restructuring process itself. In presenting comments in the text below, we have selected those that reflect a p int of view that seems to be shared by at least several respondents rather than just one or two.

The following three general conclusions arise from the data: (1) there is qualified support for restructuring in theory but dissatisfaction with the implementation process; (2) individual and school demography do not predict attitudes; and (3) between district and between school districts are substantial. We discuss these findings in sequence, presenting survey results first and then using the comments data to elaborate and clarify the statistical findings.

1. Oregon educators persist in their qualified support of restructuring concepts but may be losing support for how H.B. 3565 is being implemented

Oregon educators believe that Legislators designed the Oregon Educational Act to generate substantial changes in how schools educate children. Over 90 percent saw the legislation as directed to restructuring schools and to increasing student success, and over 80 percent saw it as an attempt to get educators to change and to increase accountability.

These beliefs suggest that respondents believed that the public, or at least key legislators, thought there were some fundamental problems with the state's schools. In fact, over half of the respondents in the first two years agreed with the statements that one of the reasons the law might be successful was that "it is time for fundamental change in education," and "the system is not working for many kids. Over 70 percent, for instance, believed the law was intended to allow "the state" to use learner outcomes to judge schools. However, this concern seems to have attenuated over the two years between our first survey in 1992 and our latest in 1994: the proportion agreeing with the statement dropped from 72 to 60 percent. At the

same time, two-thirds of the respondents believed that increased accountability would lead to improved learning, a figure that remained stable over the three administrations of the survey.

Insert Table 1 About Here

Many teachers, even supporters of the reforms, expressed deep cynicism about the political motivation underlying the legislation. In particular, many believed it was an attempt to foist a European-style tracking system onto America's traditionally more "democratic" model (there was little acknowledgement of the extent of tracking currently in high schools). Some saw it as an attempt by particular politicians to raise their visibility. As one middle school principal put it,

> I think this was a nice vehicle to the mayorship of Portland for [legislator] Vera Katz [who introduced and championed the bill and who was incidentally born in Europe]. There are some exciting possibilities here, but with lack of time and funds, I feel frustrated at the prospect of more work.

A teacher thought "3565 is nothing more than a series of hand grenades designed to force educators to change." A second complained about the process of developing the Act: "my concern is this is top down with no teacher input. It was done in the dark of night." The combination of sharply reduced funding and accelerating demands for change was a constant theme in teacher comments. A third teacher articulated a general view that legislators were detached from the every day reality of teacher work lives:

> The passage of Measure 5 and lack of support for stable school funding have made an unreality of H.B. 3565 for those of us in the classroom. We don't have time to play politics. We have to face 'Jill and Johnny' and their personal needs every day.

But this is only one side of the story: almost two-thirds of the educators surveyed thought the bill's intent included a desire to empower local school districts and to enhance teacher decision-making, positions to which teachers usually respond favorably. Two years later, the proportion believing that district empowerment was an intent had dropped while those believing teacher empowerment was an intent had climbed. These were not large swings, but may have come with experience: teachers perceived themselves to be making more decisions but they do not see district-level administration changing much.

Teacher comments give life to these numbers, and also indicate that some teachers have new appreciation of the complexity and ambiguity of changes at the building level: one teacher saw a major challenge in "getting staff to accept more responsibility for decisions [rather than the previous response, which was] to blame administration when they don't like decisions reached." Another perceived that "autonomy in my classroom would decrease" because of collaborative decision-making.

In earlier reports (Conley, et al, 1993; Goldman & Conley, 1994; Conley & Goldman, 1995), we argue that collectively Oregon's educators demonstrated neither enthusiastic support nor intransigent resistance to the restructuring legislation. About a third thought the ideas were unrealistic, another third thought the ideas made sense, but only a tenth thought that the restructuring package did not contain good educational ideas. About forty percent thought the legislation represented "too much change too fast," a remarkably low figure given the lack of funding for implementing the change and the number of teachers we've observed who seem closer to burnout than ever before, victims of high expectations and low support. These figures have remained constant.

However, something has changed. Whereas 56 percent of respondents believed in 1992 that it was "time for fundamental change" and 59 percent thought the "system isn't working for many kids," these figures dropped substantially to 42 and 50 percent respectively two years later. Faced with the prospect of changing their practices substantially, agreement on the need for "fundamental change" or "systemic change" has faded. It's worth noting, however, that those who continue to agree with these statements constitute a large block, larger than writers on educational change generally hypothesize are likely in any given school.

Many educators, but certainly not all, had high hopes initially for parts of the legislation. Forty percent thought it would benefit all students, 45 percent believed children would be better prepared for kindergarten and the same number believed that the Certificate of Initial Mastery would decrease dropouts. These figures have all declined in the face of two years' experience: lack of funding partially explains the 17 percentage point drop in beliefs that pre-schooling would make a difference, and statewide confusion about the CIM may explain the 19 point decline in the belief that peformance-based certificates would actually increase high school retention.

Agreement that the CIM and CAM would lead to enhanced student learning, originally at the two-thirds mark, also declined approximately 10 percentage points in 1994. However, educators were more optimistic about alternative learning centers and continued to believe that these would support learning and decrease dropouts. They had similarly stable, positive, beliefs about the effects of integrating social services at schools.

A majority of teachers were skeptical about the Act, and the percentage who so identified themselves grew from 52 to 63 percent over the two years. Underlying this response is some attention to broader issues of educational professionalism. There are a series of concerns around teacher work life and instructional practice that have been identified and emphasized in virtually every major survey over the past quarter century (Lortie, 1975; Rosenholtz, 1989), and on these issues the reaction of teachers to the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century is decidedly positive.

Over 60 percent of respondents believed the legislation's intent was to enhance teacher decision-making and about the same proportion believed this would actually happen. These figures increased marginally over the two years. About two-thirds of the educators surveyed thought site councils would lead to enhanced student learning, a figure that declined slightly.

Over the previous two years, site councils have become a reality in virtually every school. The effectiveness of site councils has varied widely, but only a small number have been able to lead its school into the paradigm shifts that are required to implement the Act more or less completely and faithfully. However, the percentage of respondents who believed the legislation would increase teacher collegiality rose from 51 to 60 percent, strongly suggesting that work life may have moved at least slightly in the direction of more collaboration between educational professionals. The issue of collaboration, however, was mentioned in only a few comments.

The high percentage of teachers who believed the Act would result in a larger number of instructional strategies rose from 62 to 77 percent, and the percentage who thought the Act would lead to greater curriculum integration grew from 74 to 83 percent. The proportion who expected an increase in the diversity of ways to group students stayed the same about 77 percent. These findings provide some indirect indication that teachers may, over the past two years, have begun to rethink

the ways in which they are organizing the teaching and learning in their classrooms. An additional indication is the rise from 30 to 43 percent of those who report that "schools are already doing 3565."

Discussion of how curriculum and assessment will change or has changed dominates the comments teachers gave us. Integrating curriculum and orienting instruction to individual pupil needs came up again and again. A high school teacher noted that

> the greatest change I have experienced is the move toward interdisciplinary teaching. I teach in two teams (Geo-English, & Science and Politics-Env. Science) and the coordination with teachers is great but too [time] consuming and tiring.

But this teacher was worried that "my workload is already increasing." This theme was reiterated by other teachers, for instance:

> experience and training have taught me to be an efficient instructor of groups. 3565 changes that to be a facilitator of small groups and individuals. That is a huge difference. The large groups are still there—but my role has changed. It is not efficient and physically impossible to spread instruction that thin (at least with any continuity).

An elementary teacher articulated a common dilemma:

> I feel excited about the reforms embraced by HB 3565, as I am also excited about the reforms of Goals 2000. Some of the structures seem very vague to me, and I am unsure how to begin structuring primary curriculum for the outcomes of the CIM and CAM. Where do we start?

Similarly,

> I feel positive about blended classrooms performance based outcomes, developmentally appropriate practices and providing choices. These are things I already try to implement in my classroom. I do have many concerns about the certificates of mastery and the different tracks though.

Others just feel "more time put in, not enough salary adjustment put in. Resent longer hours and lower pay, and larger classes." There is an increasing tension between the desire to change on one hand and the time and resource shortages on the other, and this came up again-and-again in educators' written comments.

The lower section of Table 1 provides an overview of the stability of responses over time and at the same time indicates probable areas of change. Because this table reports scale scores, each of which incorporates at least 5 items rather than responses to individual questions, the data are reasonably anchored, reliable, and probably not subject to either random fluctuations or idiosyncratic interpretations of wording. The results show virtually no change in supportive attitudes towards the legislation and a similar result for resistant to change. Despite two eventful years, educators' collective feelings show no substantial changes.

It is possible, perhaps even probable, that individual or school scale scores may have changed, but whatever positive and negative changes have occurred appear to cancel one another out. It is a bit surprising, given the early impact of Measure 5 budget cuts and predictions of subsequent draconian effects, that the level of enthusiasm sustained itself for two years and that large numbers of educators did not adopt the positions of overt hostility expressed by a small proportion of our respondents.

It is also interesting that the predicted level of change in practices rose somewhat while the hopes and expectations of improved outcomes declined. More educators could see and feel the impending changes, but the clouded funding picture and a lack of operational guidelines from the state agency may have dampened the optimism of some teachers and administrators. The absence of clear expectations creates anxiety for educators who are used to high levels of organizational predictabilty and low levels of ambiguity.

Educators are not sure about how much change they will have to undertake or what the specifics are of likely changes. During the first two years we conducted the survey, just under 30 percent of respondents thought they would have to change "a lot," and about two-thirds thought they would have to change "a little." The number reporting they would have to change "a lot" declined to 19 percent in 1994. Two-thirds of the survey respondents indicated they had change "some" or "a great deal".

Many comments indicated that teachers and their schools were changing. Some were general: "many of our changes are now taking place," while others cited specifics: "more cooperative planning with teachers," "more cooperative work with

colleagues," and "I am already integrating my class with another." A strongly-held contrary view states:

> parts will be possible to implement - but all (including head start & learning centers) will not. I do not think a piecemeal approach is going to change education, nor benefit students. HB 3565 could work-but it is all or nothing.

These reactions, however, were mediated by Oregon's dramatic fiscal crisis and educators' gradual realization that the change process would have to take place with fewer rather than more dollars. Concerns were reinforced when a teacher union-initiated sales tax measure was resoundingly defeated and the 1993 legislature failed to arrive at either short-term palliatives or longer-term solutions to the schools' budgetary needs. Thus it is surprising that educator support for the Act remained relatively constant even though it was apparent that school restructuring would be an "unfunded mandate" for the foreseeable future.

There were some areas where hopes and expectations—pre-school programs and the extended school year—were disappointed because the specific programs would require new funding. Nevertheless, three-fifths of the 1992 respondents to the survey disagreed with the statement that they would wait until the Act was funded to take it seriously.

And a very high proportion of educators seemed receptive to, if not enthusiastic about, some of the major philosophical underpinnings of the Act, including developmentally appropriate education, integrated curriculum, emphasis on new ways to group students and deliver instruction, integration of social services at school sites, and the belief that Oregon schools needed to address the transition from school to adulthood and the workplace. Even the basic principles of outcome-based education, which have become very controversial nationally (and in some small Oregon school districts), drew real interest and support from the state's educators.

2. Attitudes toward school restructuring legislation did not evidence any striking demographic patterns, but there are some differences worth noting

Oregon educators' response patterns, as we noted in earlier reports (Conley, et al., 1993; Goldman & Conley, 1994; Conley & Goldman, 1995), showed surprisingly little association with either individual or school demographics. The results

presented here reinforce those findings with a third year of data. Tables 2a and 2b present the relationships between scale scores and demographic differences, and include F-ratios that indicate the level of statistical significance. We have shown data from 1992 and 1994 to show differences over time and because the sample sizes are larger than for 1993. Two notes of caution. First, with large sample sizes, even small differences may prove to have statistical meaning without substantive meaning. Second, in several categories--age, district size, and region--between-group differences that do exist, even statistically significant ones, are not correlated within the entire distribution.

-Insert Table 2a and Table 2b about here-

Contrary to both the conventional wisdom and to recent findings by Auriemma and others (1992) and the Canadian Teachers Federation (King & Peart, 1992), there appears to be virtually no relationship between reactions to Oregon's restructuring legislation and the individual educator's age or experience. Oregon's teaching force is predominantly middle-aged (median age is 45) and experienced. This sample seems to be a reliable approximation of the state; almost one-half are in their forties. The relatively few teachers over 60 are less change oriented than their younger colleagues. Stereotyping is dangerous as these comments from two "older" teachers attest: "it has been the most dynamic experience of my 31 years teaching to be a vital part or all the changes" and "I'm so excited about being a part of it before I retire in 1997." Not everyone shares this view of older teachers: "it will not really affect schools until older teachers die or retire."

There are substantial differences between teachers and administrators on each of the four scales. Other certified staff—special educators, librarians, counselors—are intermediate, but much closer to teachers. Administrators are consistently more supportive of education reform and are less cynical than teachers. These differences grew significantly between our first survey in Fall 1992 and our more recent data from Fall 1994.

Comparisons between Oregon's female and male educators reveal a set of differences that appear to be growing. There were no comments that addressed gender in any fashion. Women were more change oriented, foresaw more significant changes in practices, and were more optimistic about potential outcomes. Small, but statistically significant differences in 1992 became notably larger in 1994.

In both the 1992 and 1994 data, these gender disparities appear not to be structural or derive from differences between elementary, middle, and secondary schools. Those are relatively small and became smaller over time. It does appear that high school level educators lost some of the enthusiasm for change they expressed in the first survey.

The 1992 data suggested that there might be real differences in attitudes between elementary, middle, and high school-level educators. High school teachers seemed to be more oriented to change, to express less resistance and to most expect that instructional practices would change. We speculated that these results stemmed from two factors: one analytic and one predictive of the future. Because their students are near the end of their K-12 careers, high school educators have a vantage point that allows them to see first-hand the cumulative failings that may exist in the educational system and, correspondingly, be more ready to consider drastic changes. As one high school teacher put it

> Many of the problems we see at the high school level would be alleviated if students were all successful in those early years. This includes many social problems. CIM and CAM seem to me to be premature. You are asking us to complete the finishing work on a house before the foundation has been laid.

Furthermore, because the Oregon Educational Act focused so heavily on restructuring high schools through the two Certificates of Mastery, secondary teachers may well have anticipated that their work could change dramatically. This was expressed succinctly in one comment: "most elementary schools already do a lot of what is mandated especially developmentally appropriate. I think the greatest pressure for change is at the high school level." Two years later, however, differences between schools at the three levels had all but disappeared.

District demographics explained some variance in responses to individual items and aggregated scales in the 1992. Specifically, distance from Salem, the state capitol, was inversely correlated with change orientation, anticipated changes in practices, and expectation the legislation would improve learning. Over 80 percent of Oregon's population is within an hour's drive of I-5, the interstate highway that bisects the state from Portland to the California border. Educators in districts on the I-5 corridor were somewhat more receptive to the reform legislation than those in less populated and more remote areas of the state.

It is worth noting that many of the central, eastern, and coastal districts are both rural and small, creating special problems that the following comment acknowledges: "How will rural districts provide education in all strands? Busing will be so expensive and time consuming for high school students." Political isolation and a cultural distance from the populous Willamette Valley is probably an additional factor. The Act was not written with the needs of these districts in mind, and many comments reflect this reality.

3. Significant differences exist from school to school, and district to district, even if overriding demographic patterns do not

Although individual, school building, and district demographics seem not to explain much about the sample response variance, we learn a great deal more when we take school districts, and especially schools, as units of analysis. In each of the three annual samples, statistically significant F-levels resulted for all four scales when they are broken down by school and by district. These findings showed up in both simple and nested analysis of variance (not presented here but partially reported in Conley & Goldman, 1995).

District effects appear to be slightly larger, although the small size of many schools reduces the significance levels when nested "schools within district" differences are calculated. We have some additional confidence in interpreting school differences, however, because scale means represent aggregations that result from multiplying the number of respondents per school times however many items there are in each scale.

Table 3 shows annual means on the specific scales measuring supportive of change, resistant to change, anticipated change in teaching practices, and expected outcomes for the 40 schools participating in the study in both 1992 and 1994. We excluded two schools from which received one response each, and one middle school that split into two reconstituted schools in 1993. Twenty-one of the schools also participated in the 1993 study, providing us with three years of data. Note that we could not track individual responses to see whether educators had changed their personal opinion over time. Only school averages could be calculated.

-Insert Table 3 about here-

The table presents two major, but general findings. First, there is enormous school-to-school variance on all four scales for each of the three years. For example, school means on "supportive of change" ranged from 24 to 73 in 1992, 25 to 75 in 193, and 17 to 83 in 1994. The other scales showed a correspondingly broad range. Second, although overall sample scale means changed little if at all over the three survey administrations, almost half the schools (17 of the 41) had an average change of 10 percentage points per scale between survey administrations.

Taken together, these highlights from Table 3 suggest that much of what is interesting in educators' reactions to the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century may be happening at the school level. Moreover, the extent to which schools' scores fluctuate from year-to-year may indicate that a school staff may be collectively reactive to what goes in a given year: successes, failures, changes in leadership or staffing. In a time where there is intense pressure to restructure, it is possible that these reactions may reflect how quickly or slowly the staff is able to carry out the restructuring mandates of the Act.

Examples of comments from two schools

We aggregate and summarize here the comments from two schools, a high school outside the Portland metropolitan area "Southern High," and an inner city school, "City Elementary #3," whose responses seem typical in many important respects.

Southern High landed close to all four scale means in 1992, 1993, and 1994. City Elementary #3 was less receptive to the reforms when first survey in 1992, but the staff seemed to become more positive with the passage of time. Neither school was typical—the data indicate that there were no "typical" schools—however the comments by educators in the two buildings typify the range of those encountered with some frequency.

Southern High School is a large (for Oregon) high school with over 1,500 students. It is close to the Interstate 5 corridor and has a reputation for being a successful and well-managed school but is not known for innovative programs. Southern's students are predominantly middle class, and its SES ranking is in the upper half of the state's high schools. Early staff reaction seems to have been mixed, and included some resentment:

> schools are not failing, students are, and their failure is a result of many things — parental neglect, the generally rotten public attitude and willingness to blame schools for their failure.

Some teachers expressed ignorance and confusion: "I feel in the dark, isolated about it all and unsure of how it will. . . 'I'm just a teacher.'" However, many of the staff had begun to think about what they might have to do to prepare for the changes. The following are typical comments: "possibly some curriculum 'adjustments.'" "Perhaps a slightly different emphasis in my subject area." "Apply more "real world" assignments to students' reading and writing." "Helping students make appropriate choices regarding tracking."

A year later, teachers were more knowledgeable, yet staff opinions seemed to be a bit more divided. Some negative remarks include "lack of adequate funding. . . unrealistic financial expectations" and "I was positive; have been made bitter by poor/destructive state department's and legislative management." On the other hand some staff members stayed positive: "Am happy to see the non-college students helped."

The 1993 comments appeared to focus less on what the school would have to do to implement the changes: did they say all they had to say during the first year? Even some of the predominantly optimistic educators seemed to have conflicted views:

> the site committee part of the law has great potential to change educational practices. CIM? CAM will, I'm afraid, only result in another paper work make-over, but not change education significantly. As a member of a site committee I feel for the first time that significant changes that are desired by teachers can be made.

By 1994 some of the same concerns persisted. Some educators still believed the changes were ill-advised or at least ill-thought out:

> I feel CIM/CAM is like a train that started running down the track before they finished laying the track. I think that will become apparent shortly.

A more common worry was that the state could not sustain the changes they had initiated three years previously. Two comments illustrate these sentiments. First, "we need a stronger push from above, state dept., professors, district personnel as to why this is necessary and will work." And,

> I feel that the legislature will find a loop hole which enables them to underfund the changes. CAM is probably at great risk. If it is, we will have destroyed our college prep successes—something we are very good at.

Many teachers were beginning to see the tasks before them a bit more clearly. In responding to the question about what changes they would have to make if the Act were to be successful in their school, many teachers indicated that they would have to change curriculum and assessment. For example, "in order to implement the portfolios that seem to be a part of 3565's plan, I will have to work more at the evaluation of work for creativity and function in addition to content" and "documentation of competencies. Some modification to help students meet all the competencies."

Many teachers seemed to be rethinking a great deal of what they would have to do in the future. Much of the potential changes could have profound effects on the nature of the secondary classroom: "the teacher will not have to lead in a way that keeps students on the 'same page'—encourage kids at their own pace and style. Less focus on content and textbooks. Opportunities to get to know students as individuals will increase." Another teacher saw the new role as "allowing students more say/responsibility in their learning; taking myself out of the driver's seat and becoming a facilitator (a drivers ed. teacher, so to speak)." At Southern, some teachers were even seeing the new environment as one that resembles an educational market. "[I'll have to change] my recruiting practices for my elective program. The way I package my classes and my curriculum."

City Elementary #3 faces very different problems. City is a small school located in a very poor neighborhood. City's students come from very disadvantaged backgrounds: the school ranks in the lowest SES decile according to the formula the state uses to assess determine state aid. Early reactions to the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century reflect the ambivalent, sometimes overwhelmed attitudes teachers bring with them to work. One teacher admitted now knowing much about the new law:

> I have heard of the Katz bill but I don't know any of the particulars, and I don't know enough to comment on it. Sorry, I would be happy to learn more and read the Bill if presented the material.

Another needed "more information." More typically:

> You can't make a silk purse out of a sow's ear, but at the same time we've got to help society meet the educational needs of the young without being negative. We have such a large number of children that are so needy that it is sometimes overwhelming to feel that you're probably the surest thing they've come in contact with. Hopefully the earlier intervention will promote more healthy people ready to learn entering school.

The following illustrates this further:

> Don't really know. Hope counselors are still in buildings, if the plan is to better integrate social services, counselors must be in place, they are the initial level of intervention.

City is a tough school and one teacher thought they would be likely to "jump out of the frying pan into the fire." Other teachers were worried that they would have to do more for less. An example:

> I worry that teachers will be required too lots of extra work (such as site-based councils) without extra pay. I feel that for HB 3565 to be implemented well it requires a lot of staff development outside of class time and I have doubts about whether we will be given adequate training and planning time.

Despite these concerns, some teachers seemed willing to withhold judgment for a while. One such response was "I'm not sure as yet but I'm willing to be open minded and work for better education for students." But in 1992 the educators at City were not very optimistic about the ability of the state to follow through on the promise of the Act: "it takes money for what this bill wants. Preschool for all is great and smaller classroom is great . But. . . we now must argue and fight for this."

By 1994, several of City's teachers had begun to learn about and adapt to the new expectations, but most felt they that they had to learn more and two more: Comments from three different teachers depict this attitude:

> I feel like I'm getting bits and pieces of information from various classes, workshops and meetings. I would like the opportunity to take a workshop and spend some time finding out what is contained in 3565 and how it will change my teaching.

> I'm not sure what I will have to change. I'm continually trying to change and improve. So hopefully it will be a gradual change.

> I still use some traditional teaching strategies that would not be deemed developmentally appropriate and does not reach all students.

Three years after passage of the Act, teachers at City were still looking for meaningful help to make the changes the legislation requires. It may be significant that they looked to the state rather than to the district to provide the needed assistance. One City teacher expressed a view shared by several colleagues: "I do believe many things in this bill are super. I want the funding to occur before I take it to heart. If educators do this without funding, then there will only be more of this manipulation in the future." A second put similar thoughts in slightly different language:

> I believe all staff should have thorough inservices on the immediate expectations and future direction of this HB. The state needs to provide money to make these transitions meaningful, not political. Educational planning should not be taken lightly and priorities should include thorough and complete training of educators to enable success for kids.

At the same time, one of City's teachers was "looking at the desired fundamental qualities of the students and making sure I am incorporating all of them."

The summary of comments at Southern High and City Elementary are illustrative only. We do not know enough about all the schools to generalize safely, but there does seem to be a great deal of movement to implement at least the early stages of the reforms envisioned by Oregon's educational restructuring legislation. These two schools, neither of which are considered leaders in school restructuring provide a glimpse of the human side of the summary statistics we provided above.

Discussion

What do these findings signify about the role of state legislation and more generally for state-level policy formulation as a lever for launching large-scale school reform? In Oregon it appears that the passage of H.B. 3565, the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century, caught the attention of educators. Whatever the initial impressions, these were probably reinforced by the flurry of activity demonstrated by the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) during the 1991-92 school year. The ODE established task forces, called conferences, and sent staff all

over the state to present and discuss plans for implementing the Act and to answer questions from anxious educators and the public. Moreover, in that first year, department staff generated a series of general clarifying position papers and timelines necessary to create the detail necessary for the new legislation to take effect.

Thus, from the very beginning, educators had the impression that the ODE would have an activist orientation toward school restructuring. This activism was something of a break from the department's tradition as an administrative and regulative body rather than one with a major policy role.

Oregon's educators did not underestimate the potential magnitude of change mandated by the reform legislation. Many teachers saw that "student-driven curriculum. . . will place different expectations on teachers . . . and the move away from age and time based indicators of student progression to competency-based will require considerable change in how I have previously 'run' my classroom." Moreover teachers "are feeling overwhelmed, criticized, and devalued."

Despite the bite to these statements, a majority of teachers do appear to support the changes in principle. Educator comments reflect enthusiasm and excitement, for example "I feel excited about the reforms embraced by HB 3565, as I am also excited about the reforms of Goals 2000. some of the structures seem very vague to me, and I am unsure how to begin structuring primary curriculum for the outcomes of the CIM and CAM. Where do we start?" Those who are opposed to the reforms, however, have very strong feelings. As these are reflected in day-to-day interactions at work, they provide a partial explanation of why some schools experience significant conflict and/or have difficulty building consensus for change.

As we have noted previously, the fact that the Legislature imposed the act on the schools was a source of substantial educator resentment, but many of the provisions dovetailed with the concerns and prior activities that already existed in a significant number of schools. There were districts and schools, many of them stimulated by the school restructuring/professional development grants legislated in 1987, that had begun a series of projects and activities under the general rubric of restructuring, and a significant proportion of these had developed site teams that were increasing teacher participation in school policy development.

Many schools were attempting to implement "developmentally appropriate practices" and multi-age classroom structures at the primary level, and many secondary schools were at least considering how to improve curriculum integration and to explore a wider range of instructional practices.

Given this early openness to reform, how should those elements of the 1994 data which show decreasing educator support for key elements of reform and increasing skepticism be interpreted? At the very least, they send a warning signal that there are limits to the tolerance educators have when being expected to sustain major change with little support or clear direction.

After the initial burst of energy by ODE to convene task forces with broad-based representation, the design process bogged down in several important areas, most notably the assessment system for the CIM and the overall design and standards for the CAM. The effect of these slowdowns may be to hold back those schools and educators most interested in actualizing the reforms. At the very least, a lack of common definitions and expectations at the state level forces each school to deal with these issues before they begin program design. Or, conversely, they encounter difficulties precisely because they do not have schoolwide agreement on basic elements of reform; what is required, what it should look like, how students will be assessed, how programs will be assessed.

This lack of definition and direction empowers cynics, as does the lack of funding or provision of time by the legislature. Our data indicate a small, vocal, and emotional group of active opponents, and suggest a much larger group in the "wait and see" camp. Many of the actions of the state have increased the vulnerability of the risk takers and reinforced the opponents. The drop in support for key elements of reform such as the CIM and CAM probably indicate that the "wait and see" group is losing faith; they were willing to believe these reforms could make a difference, but now see them as hopelessly bogged down, overly complex, and unclear. As comments indicated, they need to see how it will affect them in the classroom and what its concrete effects will be before they change their practices. Having waited, they now are beginning to believe they see the inevitable climax and denouement of this drama.

And yet, perhaps forty percent of respondents believe their schools are already doing much of what the law expects. Even allowing for exaggeration, this suggests a

significant amount of change has already occurred. The question becomes: what would happen if H.B. 3565 went away tomorrow? Might it already have had such an impact that its effects would continue to be felt in many ways, although not necessarily in ways the framers of the legislation had envisioned?

If this is the case, then systemic school reform legislation would indeed have had a significant effect on educational practice, even in the absence of many of the supposed prerequisites, such as time, money, technical assistance, and a clear, coherent policy framework. The Act may have served a catalytic function, initiating in schools a whole series of reactions. This metaphor would explain the discrepancy between the population-level demographic data, where there were few differences, and the school-level data, where there were many. The external force of legislation may have entered the relatively closed system of the local school and caused a whole new series of human interactions to occur. New leaders and spokespeople may have arisen. Retreats and planning meetings may have taken place. Articles may have been read and distributed. Visits to other sites may have occurred. All of these actions have a catalyzing effect on familiar patterns of thought and interaction that are present in most every school.

Although we say "may" a great deal in the preceding paragraph, other studies we have conducted during this same period of time tend to confirm these conjectures (Conley, 1991; Conley, 1993; Goldman, et al., 1993. The Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century inadvertently built upon activities many schools had already initiated under a previous school improvement program ("2020" Schools).

In that sense, the pattern here may come to reflect the findings of Berman and McLaughlin (1978) almost twenty years ago. In that study of local implementation of federal programs, the authors concluded that "the net return to the general invesment was the adoption of many innovations, the successful implementation of few, and the long-run continuation of still fewer..."

We may be witnessing this pattern once again if reform legislation is removed, modified, or if key issues such as time, resources, and program definition are not resolved. Berman and McLaughlin (1978) concluded primarily that local context was key to understanding how policies were translated into programs at the site level. H.B. 3565 has had whatever effect it is going to have on reshaping the

local context. Consideration will now need to be given to how to sustain whatever reframing or reshaping of educators' thoughts and practices that has occurred.

McLaughlin (1991) in a followup to the Berman and McLaughlin study offers the following generalizations about the relationship between policy and practice that are informative when applied to Oregon's attempt to reshape schools via state-level policy and little else:

- It is exceedingly difficult for policy to change practice, especially across levels of government.
- Implementation dominates outcome
- Policy can't mandate what matters
- Local variability is the rule; uniformity is the exception

One difference between the motivation Oregon schools have to implement reform and that found in many of the schools in the Berman and McLaughlin study is that few schools are pursuing reform implementation for "opportunistic" reasons. There are few dollars available to assist, not enough to make this the primary driving force behind implementation. Therefore, when a school faculty does undertake to implement the Act's provisions, they likely do so primarily because they perceive a match between the law and their local site needs.

What does all of this suggest for the "top-down/bottom-up" formula being offered for systemic reform either implicitly (example) or explicitly (Goals 2000)? We provide evidence that top-down reforms can have a catalyzing and energizing effect if they capture key themes relevant to educators. However, if every subsequent action from the top serves to confuse, frustrate, or attenuate the bottom-up program development that is sparked by the initial reform vision, failure seems likely.

No one in Oregon ever articulated this formula when drafting H.B. 3565, although its sponsor described it repeatedly as a "wake-up call for educators." The difficulty with this formula is that different actors control the policy agenda at the different levels, top and bottom. These actors may or may not share much in common in their goals for educational improvement.

If education policy continues to become politicized, as more elements of it have during the past several years, the ability to direct it from the top in ways that

enable corresponding actions from the bottom will likely be restricted. Top-down policy will serve to energize local educators only if there is some consistency to it and some minimal awareness by legislators and state department of education personnel that their goals are first, to create a broad framework that supports those local educators committed to improvement; second, to provide enough resources or time for key "lighthouse" schools to adapt; third, to successfully develop rules and regulations in reaction to and support of new models and responses occurring in the lighthouse schools specifically and throughout the system more generally; and fourth, to identify accountability mechanisms that create gentle discomfort for those who choose to ignore or resist the overall policy direction and some moderate rewards for those who pursue reform goals.

Educators have proven repeatedly that they play a game of "follow the leader," particularly when there is both incentive and sanction operating in tandem and the basic ideas behind the reform are palatable. This phenomenon, known as "institutional isomorphism," is prevalent in most sectors of the economy and society where stable organizations or institutions exist. Schools certainly meet this criterion. Systemic reform need not compel or mandate every required action if it can achieve a critical mass of districts that create the bottom-up responses that translate reform ideals into specific programs for the remaining educators throughout the system. The legislation provides a jump start, but does not explain why and how some schools, and some states, can internally generate the necessary energy to fuel restructuring and others cannot.

The Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century had and may still have the potential to be the triggering event that initiates the chain reaction described above. However, all chain reactions stall if certain conditions do not continue to exist and others come into being. Systemic school reform in Oregon appears poised at a crucial point in the reaction sequence. The ways in which educators intrepret the actions of the legislature and department of education over the next year should indicate whether the reactions become self-sustaining, or are extinguished.

References

Auriemma, F., Cooper, B., & Smith, S. (1992). Graying teachers: A report on state pension systems and school district early retirement Incentives. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Berman, P. & McLaughlin, M. (1978). Federal programs supporting educational change. Volume 8: Implementing and sustaining Innovations. Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, CA.].

Carnegie Corporation of New York (1989). Turning points: Preparing American youth for the 21st century. Report of the task force on education of young adolescents. Waldorf, MD: Carnegie Council for Adolescent Development.

Conley, D. (1991). Lessons from laboratories in school restructuring and site-based decision-making : Oregon's "2020" schools take control of their own reform. Eugene, Or.: Oregon School Study Council

Conley, D. (1993, December). Evaluation of Perceptions of Changes in Oregon Network Schools. U.S. Department of Education, Fund for Innovation in Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. CFDA Number 84:215E-1).

Conley, D. & Goldman, P. (1994). Ten Propositions for Facilitative Leadership. In Murphy, Joseph & Karen Seashore Louis (Eds.), Reshaping the Principalship: Insights from Transformational Reform Efforts. (237-262). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Conley, D. & Goldman, P. (1995). Reactions from the field to state restructuring legislation. Forthcoming in Educational Administration Quarterly.

Conley, D., Goldman, P., & Dunlap, D. (1993). Radical state legislation and school restructuring: Oregon educators' reactions to the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century. OSSC Report, 33, 1, 1-13.

Goldman, P. & Conley, D. (1994) School responses to state-level restructuring legislation. OSSC Reports, 35, 1 (Supplement), 1-24

Goldman, P., Dunlap, D. & Conley, D. (1993). Facilitative power and non-standardized solutions to school site restructuring. Educational Administration Quarterly, 29, 1, 69-92.

King, A. J. C. & Peart, M. (1992). Teachers in Canada: Their Work and Quality of Life. Ottawa, Ontario: Canadian Teachers Federation. Rosenholtz

Lortie, D. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McLaughlin, M. (1991). The Rand Change Agent Study: Ten Years Later. In Odden, Allan (Eds.), Education Policy Implementation. Albany: State University of New York.Murphy, J. and Louis, K. (1994). Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

National Center for Education and the Economy(1990). America's choice: High skills or low wages. Rochester, N.Y.: National Center on Education and the Economy.

Rosenholtz, S. (1989). Teachers' workplace: The social organization of schools. New York: Longman.

U.S. Department of Education (1991). America 2000: An education strategy. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Table 1. Selected Survey Items, 1992, 1993, 1994

Survey Item	Mean 1992	Mean 1993	Mean 1994
		(Percent Agree)	
intent-increase student success	91	92	91
intent-restructure public education	96	96	95
intent-get educators to change	80	83	82
intent-increase accountability	80	77	76
intent-learner outcomes to judge schools	72	70	60
increased accountability will lead to learning	67	64	66
intent-empower local school districts	66	64	57
intent-enhance teacher decision-making	63	72	68
because ideas make sense	33	33	38
because not good educational ideas	10	13	11
because too much change too fast	43	42	42
because time for fundamental change	56	55	42
because system isnt working for many kids	59	55	50
funding for preschool will lead to learning	84	79	69
effect-CIM will decrease dropouts	45	45	26
CIM will lead to learning	66	63	55
CAM will lead to learning	65	63	56
Alt learning centers will lead to learning	86	78	81
Coordination of social services at the school site	81	72	74
I am skeptical	52	52	63
site councils will lead to learning	69	67	65
effect-increased teacher collegiality	51	56	60
effect-increase no of instructional strategies	62	71	77
effect-greater curriculum integration	74	77	83
effect-diverse ways to group students	77	77	76
because schools are already doing 3565	30	35	43
would have to change a lot	29	27	19
how much I've changed		hardly: 43 some: 45 gt deal: 12	hardly: 33 some: 58 gt deal: 8
how much my school has changed		hardly: 21 some: 57 gt deal: 22	hardly: 16 some: 64 gt deal: 20
Scale 1: Supportive of change	41	41	41
Scale 2: Resistant to change	35	32	34
Scale 3: Changes in practices	61	65	66
Scale 4: Learning outcomes	64	60	57

Table 2a. Scale Means by Individual, Building, and District Demographics, 1992

		Supportive of change	Resistant to change	Changes in practices	Learning outcomes	N
		Percent 'agree' responses				
Sample Mean		41.0	34.7	60.7	63.9	2,257
Sample S.D.		30.3	22.7	32.2	23.2	
Position						
Teachers		39.6	36.4	58.7	62.5	1,750
Other certified staff		44.0	34.2	63.7	66.7	317
Administrators		55.4	32.6	76.9	73.2	153
	F=	20.1***	29.0***	17.9***	23.5***	
Men		40.6	33.3	58.5	60.8	872
Women		42.0	35.8	62.4	65.9	1,310
	F=	0.2	6.7**	7.4**	22.8***	
Age						
20-29		37.4	38.4	59.2	63.1	162
30-39		40.0	35.2	62.2	63.3	526
40-49		42.9	33.7	61.8	64.9	1009
50-59		41.5	35.2	58.9	63.6	478
60+		43.0	40.9	49.4	54.4	27
	F=	1.6	2.2	1.5	1.7	
School Level						
High schools		45.0	32.1	64.8	64.3	802
Junior high & middle		38.7	35.1	54.0	63.3	596
Elementary		39.1	38.5	61.0	63.1	768
	F=	9.2***	10.3***	16.1***	0.3	
District Size						
15,000+		38.9	37.5	55.6	63.5	458
5000-14999		41.9	33.5	62.1	64.3	928
2000-4999		41.6	32.3	65.7	63.7	440
100-1999		40.9	38.7	55.9	63.9	234
	F=	1.3	8.1***	9.9***	0.2	
Region						
Portland Metro		38.3	37.4	55.9	62.1	933
Willamette Valley		46.6	32.0	67.6	67.8	728
Southern Oregon		41.4	30.2	63.0	65.2	246
Central/Eastern		31.8	41.2	55.3	56.5	137
Oregon Coast		39.4	33.0	59.4	61.2	210
	F=	9.0***	11.8***	13.9***	10.3***	

*p < .05 **p < .01 ***p<.001

Table 2b. Scale Means by Individual, Building, and District Demographics, 1994

		Supportive of change	Resistant to change	Changes in practices	Learning outcomes	N
		Percent 'agree' responses				
Sample Mean		41.4	34.1	65.6	56.7	1,247
Sample S.D.		32.0	22.8	30.5	26.3	
Position						
Teachers		39.2	35.5	63.1	53.7	989
Other certified staff		47.4	32.8	73.2	61.7	147
Administrators		76.2	17.3	84.9	70.3	50
	F=	11.5***	14.7***	10.1***	10.3***	
Gender						
Men		36.6	35.9	62.3	49.7	537
Women		46.0	32.6	68.2	61.2	671
	F=	13.2***	3.2*	5.5**	25.1***	
Age						
20-29		35.6	33.0	67.3	56.7	86
30-39		44.4	31.8	64.8	57.9	247
40-49		40.6	35.0	64.5	53.8	547
50-59		43.9	34.6	68.1	57.9	305
60+		44.2	30.3	67.5	66.6	19
	F=	1.7	1.0	0.7	2.0	
School Level						
High schools		41.1	33.6	64.5	53.2	596
Junior high & middle		39.8	34.2	66.1	56.8	315
Elementary		44.2	35.5	65.6	59.2	311
	F=	1.7	0.7	0.3	4.9**	
District Size						
15,000+		43.5	33.7	63.5	59.2	244
5,000-14,999		40.5	33.6	64.8	55.3	572
2,000-4,999		39.0	35.9	65.3	51.7	326
100-1,999		49.3	31.9	70.0	62.7	105
	F=	3.4*	1.1	1.6	5.5**	
Region						
Portland Metro		43.7	34.2	65.4	57.8	388
Willamette Valley		46.0	33.5	67.7	58.3	386
Southern Oregon		33.7	34.7	61.7	51.2	320
Central/Eastern		32.7	35.0	63.2	55.2	60
Oregon Coast		42.4	37.0	65.9	52.3	93
	F=	7.5***	0.9	1.6	3.5**	

*p < .05 **p < .01 **p< .001

Table 3. School-by-School Scale Comparisons, 1992 through 1994

	Percent Agree														
	1992					1993					1994				
	Supportive	Resistant	Practices	Outcomes	N	Supportive	Resistant	Practices	Outcomes	N	Supportive	Resistant	Practices	Outcomes	N
Total Sample	41	35	61	64	2185	41	32	65	60	600	41	34	66	57	1247
city hs	51	28	71	55	28						54	29	77	64	27
midcity hs	45	32	65	68	65	37	28	56	56	51	48	21	69	60	26
suburban hs	39	33	53	61	57	28	43	53	50	51	40	42	59	58	31
suburb hs	48	35	68	66	80	49	29	65	60	70	49	29	71	56	73
southern hs	41	28	55	64	45	44	26	60	62	55	35	33	61	53	55
agri hs	50	27	81	69	67	44	35	79	58	26	39	40	64	49	66
coastal hs	45	29	66	67	67						50	27	77	56	23
eastern hs	37	36	58	58	44	27	31	61	54	34	36	31	64	55	20
midsouth hs	47	27	71	64	43						29	41	53	42	56
northwest hs	56	25	64	69	16						43	36	71	59	20
valley hs	42	36	61	63	33						37	41	55	50	50
southern jh	45	26	64	68	27						33	36	70	50	49
midcity ms	46	27	74	74	28	47	27	71	62	31	67	19	82	67	12
suburban inter	39	35	47	65	54						30	36	57	66	12
suburb ms	36	25	65	61	35	40	35	70	62	18	42	36	66	54	32
coastal ms	42	42	45	49	12	36	35	61	55	25	30	45	59	45	16
midsouth ms	46	29	60	63	25	48	34	70	62	19	33	28	73	53	15
northwest ms	36	51	41	51	11						47	41	55	57	14
valley ms#1	47	18	73	81	9						46	31	64	59	21
valley ms#2	57	22	69	72	24	52	32	73	69	28	53	23	80	67	22
city elem#1	24	40	35	52	11	35	31	58	50	8	40	27	57	54	11
city elem#2	34	32	65	70	13	42	44	46	60	12	28	50	54	59	12
city elem#3	39	53	61	58	20						62	24	72	72	11
suburban elem#1	32	44	46	56	22	25	41	57	55	20	42	48	55	55	23
suburban elem#2	24	47	43	51	20						31	38	56	48	15
suburb elem#1	38	37	53	62	25						50	27	72	64	14
suburb elem#2	28	37	46	47	23	34	35	62	57	21	27	45	43	45	21
southern elem#1	42	35	71	63	17						57	35	68	67	6
southern elem#2	32	33	63	68	13	34	38	80	62	13	38	40	51	56	11
agri elem#1	57	32	73	71	14						41	32	67	65	29
agri elem#2	75	15	85	81	11						39	43	50	41	18
coastal elem#1	26	27	66	62	13						40	36	69	56	15
coastal elem#2	50	19	77	69	8	44	43	74	62	16	40	53	68	41	5
eastern elem	49	29	81	81	7	34	38	75	70	10	43	17	75	53	8
midsouth elem	36	40	65	56	9						34	42	61	48	13
south valley elem	51	43	52	47	7						53	36	80	64	21
valley elem#1	44	40	59	58	23	42	32	65	66	13	39	42	55	54	
valley elem#2	60	16	87	76	14	75	16	94	87	16	83	8	93	91	8
valley elem#3	50	32	81	62	12						40	42	82	55	9
west valley elem	73	31	88	80	16	60	23	89	89	10	59	15	89	85	17